

DRAFT: Burke-Gilman Trail Redevelopment Study Citizens Advisory Group
Minutes of January 25, 2005

CAG members present: Jeff Weissman, Dean Peterson, Sandy Koppenol, Alison Starling, Tim Ahern, Tom French, Gary Elmer, Mark Withers, Jon Skamser, Michelle LeMoine, Mark Gibbons, Stuart Strand, Kate Comtois.

Welcoming remarks: Jessie Israel, King County

King County trails coordinator

- Robert Foxworthy was introduced as King County's Trails Coordinator and said he is looking forward to interacting with the group. Foxworthy replaces long-time coordinator Tom Eksten, who retired late last year. Foxworthy said that while he is new to the Lake Forest Park section of the Burke Gilman Trail, he has extensive experience with community projects as an urban planner, transportation planner and in facilities management.
- Foxworthy spoke briefly about King County and national trail guidelines that will help guide design and construction for the redevelopment. He presented a handout with information from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines for Shared Use Paths.
- CAG asked if the county is obliged to use the guidelines as a result of any funding source. Foxworthy responded there is not a legal requirement, but that some funding sources may consider use of best practices.

Trail walk debrief

- CAG members discussed the January 8 trail view trip, with many expressing a deeper appreciation of other interest groups' views.
- Observations included:
 - * Obscured sight lines, due to vegetation, landscaping and inclines
 - * Lack of lighting, on some dark segments of trail and at chicanes
 - * Uncontrolled speed of bicycles
 - * Lack of delineation of public right of way
 - * Chicanes funnel users into one another
 - * Property owners have encroached on the trail
 - * Property lines don't necessarily reflect where fencing is located
 - * Three major street crossings dangerous, with inconsistent stop signage
 - * Many user conflicts, with most serious where vehicles cross trail
 - * Cyclists not stopping at stop signs
 - * Lack of signage, or incorrect signs
- Possible solutions suggested included:
 - * Mirrors
 - * Lighted signaling system
 - * Lights on the trail
 - * Painted lanes

- * Speed bumps
 - * Tunnel
 - * Frontage road along trail
- Dean Peterson said a lot of the issues are covered in a supplemented Environmental Impact Statement from when the original trail was constructed in the '70s. Peterson handed out some highlights from the EIS. CAG members requested full copies of the report.

Keeping citizens informed

- Jessie Israel mentioned that King County is working with the City of Lake Forest Park to keep trailside homeowners informed as the effort moves forward. CAG members suggested updates should go out to all LFP residents, possibly via the Town Crier or the Lake Forest Park Enterprise. Israel requested that members forward ideas for keeping citizens informed to King County.

New CAG contact for King County

- Israel said Brooke Bascom will return by the next CAG meeting. Bascom was instrumental in organizing the CAG, but was replaced by Logan Harris while she was out on maternity leave. Bascom will serve as the group's main point of contact for King County and help coordinate CAG meetings. Her e-mail is brooke.bascom@metrokc.gov.

Redevelopment study update

- CAG members were provided with copies of previously prepared reports relating to the Lake Forest Park section of the Burke Gilman Trail, including a Northwest Arborvitae arborist report, an HWA Geosciences BGT Slides Study report, a PACRIM Geotechnical Report and a Preliminary Adolfson Associates Wetland Reconnaissance study.
- Kevin Brown, King County Parks, provided updates on various elements of the redevelopment study, stating that the next pieces to be delivered to the group in late February or early March include a Survey of Trail Right-of-Way, a study of signage and traffic issues, and a description of environmental issues.
- Other pieces due in April include preliminary assessments and descriptions of trail section alternatives, utility/drainage issues, landscaping treatment alternatives, opportunities and constraints to redevelopment, and SEPA review integrated into the process.

Public input

- CAG members discussed how to welcome more public input into the Redevelopment Study process. Members agreed to allow 10 minutes at the opening of each meeting to hear from the public.

Next meeting

- The next meeting was scheduled for February 15 (the meetings was later postponed).